

THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM IN ASIA

*by Francis A. Young**

GEOGRAPHICALLY speaking, one may say that the Fulbright program began in Asia, since China and Burma were the first two countries to exchange students and professors with the United States after the program got under way in 1948. Now, 13 years later, 40 countries are taking part. Thirteen of these are in Asia; 13 are in Europe; and 14 are in Latin America, Africa, and the rest of the world combined. The Asian sector of the program is therefore important historically and from the standpoint of size. It is also important to the national interest, since the stability, prosperity, and continued independence of the free countries of Asia are essential to the security of the United States.

This brief report on the Fulbright program in Asia is based upon a visit last January and February to ten countries, including Japan, Korea, China (Taiwan), the Philippines, Thailand, Burma, India, Ceylon, Pakistan, and Iran. The seven weeks available for the trip were all too short. Nevertheless, even the transient visitor, by leaning heavily on those who have been in Asia a long time and by looking through their eyes as well as his own, may greatly enlarge and deepen his appreciation and understanding of the Asian scene. The close-up view also dispels many of the misconceptions developed at a distance, and one sees his surviving knowledge in better perspective and proportions.

*The author is Executive Secretary of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons appointed in 1948 by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils (American Council on Education, American Council of Learned Societies, National Research Council, and Social Science Research Council). The committee cooperates with the Department of State and the Board of Foreign Scholarships in administration of the Fulbright Educational Exchange Program as it applies to advanced research and university teaching.

Generalizing about the countries of Asia is risky after a short visit and difficult under any conditions. Asian countries differ from each other more than is popularly supposed. Many are more easily compared with the United States or England than with their neighbors. An American will quickly feel at home in Manila or New Delhi, but not in Seoul or Bangkok. Nevertheless, this report casts prudence aside and hazards a few generalizations on those aspects of life in noncommunist Asia that seem to have an important bearing on our educational and cultural relations.

First, one must generalize on the possibility and rate of progress in Asia, if only to determine one's attitude toward American aid and toward the Fulbright program in particular. The point of view of this report may be stated as a "counter-generalization," namely, that Asia is far from being the overpopulated and exhausted land, teeming with ignorant, shiftless, and diseased persons, which many imagine. It is true that populations in India and East Pakistan, and to a lesser extent in Ceylon and Taiwan, are extremely dense and that poverty is widespread. In these countries population control is, or soon will be, the overriding problem. On the other hand, Iran, Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, and West Pakistan have space and resources for much larger populations. Japan has brought its population, after a long and rapid rise, into approximate balance with its resources. Even in India and East Pakistan, population pressures could be eased temporarily by reclaiming large areas of waste or abandoned land or by cultivating off-season crops. Moreover, the physical and intellectual capacities of the Asian peoples are high. Although the adult populations reflect in their appearance their hard struggle for

survival, the bright faces of the children and their finely formed physiques dispel any notion of inferiority. The human material is good; the tragedy is that it is so incompletely and inefficiently used. The root problem of Asia may be defined in one way as that of establishing a social and economic order in which everyone has an opportunity to work and is encouraged to do so by a reasonable return from his labor. The solutions to this problem are psychological and educational as well as economic and political, and it is clear that a more balanced approach is needed in American aid programs. Unless there is no hope of better labor utilization or of an eventual balance between population and resources, the efforts to assist the peoples of Asia to achieve freedom and material well-being must go on. In this context the Fulbright and other American aid programs are not money down the Asian drain, but may spell the difference between steady progress toward greater democracy and freedom or an accelerating decline which can be reversed only by radical or revolutionary means.

ASIAN VIEWS OF THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Because the problems of Asia seem insoluble to some American observers, or at least beyond the reach of American aid, the Fulbright exchange program is still viewed with skepticism by many people in the United States. But in Asia one can generalize and say that the program enjoys immense prestige. This popularity reflects in part the universal faith of Asians in education as the main avenue of individual advancement and social progress. It is also attributable to the efficiency with which the local foundation and embassy staffs administer the program. One may not agree with all the policies pursued by the foundations, but the impartiality with which the foreign grantees are selected and the integrity of the local administration are generally beyond question and have done much to raise standards of educational practice in Asian countries.

Another generalization of some importance to the exchange program is that living conditions are steadily improving in most parts of Asia. The tremendous effort to stimulate economic growth and educational development is taking effect. All classes share in the "rising tide of expectation"; all plan and act as though their expectations will be realized. The pace of change varies, of course, by country, being extremely rapid in Japan, less rapid in India, and slow in Ceylon and Iran. Where it is slow, there is an impatience and discontent easy to detect. One effect of this progressive spirit is to put strong pressure on the Fulbright program to contribute directly to national development. The program is viewed in definitely practical terms—as a means of shoring up

the overburdened Asian educational institutions, and of helping to establish and operate good libraries, laboratories, and respectable graduate programs in fields other than medicine and law. Even more conscious of his needs than an American university president, if that be possible, is the Asian rector or vice-chancellor. He is a realist; he knows the deficiencies of his institution in comparison with universities in the West, and he is well aware of how difficult it is to raise standards without substantial outside aid. Hence, he is a strong advocate of the Fulbright program; he wishes it were much larger; and he would like the Fulbright lecturers to stay long enough—at least two years—to be of real and lasting benefit. Indeed, the task of transforming higher education in Asia is so great that the Fulbright programs now active there could be increased three, five, or even more times in size without reaching the point of diminishing returns.

THE AMERICAN GRANTEE IN ASIA

A related comment based on numerous interviews with the current grantees is that apart from financial problems, which are still serious in many cases, the lot of the Fulbright professor in Asia is not hard. A few assignments in outlying universities present difficulties because of inadequate transportation, shopping, recreational, and health facilities (these locations should be avoided by the less hardy), but otherwise there has been a rapid improvement in the Fulbright professor's standard of living in most cities in Asia. The situation in Dacca is a good example of this. Until recently, Fulbright assignments in Dacca were viewed as an exacting test of the adaptability and durability of American grantees. In contrast, the morale of the grantees in Dacca last winter was very high, and they asked that a special effort be made to counteract the impression that Dacca was a hardship post. Two factors seem to be influential here: one, a marked improvement in living conditions in Dacca over the last few years, especially for those dependent on the local economy; the other, a greater willingness in the Fulbright Foundation and the American Embassy in Karachi to assist grantees with housing and transportation.

The prospects of the average Fulbright grantee going to Asia may be described in even more positive terms. In some countries the concern of the Fulbright Foundation for his welfare and the charm of the locality in which he works provide an experience which contrasts pleasantly with the routines and pressures of campus life in the United States. One should have no hesitation in urging American scholars to accept Fulbright lectureships in such beautiful and culturally interesting places

as Peradenya, Mandalay, Lahore, Madras, Teheran, Kyoto, Bangkok, and Taipei, provided, of course, they can finance their dependents' travel without undue strain. Academic and scholarly opportunities will not be as great as those in Europe, except in a few highly specialized fields, but in other respects a Fulbright appointment in Asia has more to offer in new intellectual and emotional experiences, especially for the many scholars who have been to Europe but have not yet visited the Orient.

From talking with the Fulbright professors in Asia, one gets the impression that for most of them the principal problem is not in adjusting to a harsh environment. It is rather in finding useful and satisfying places in the native educational community and in the local American diplomatic establishment. In both circles the Fulbright professor is a conspicuous and sometimes an important figure. His obligations sometimes conflict and cause problems, although it is usually possible for him to play both roles in such a way that they mutually support each other.

The problem of finding a suitable place in the local American diplomatic establishment is attributable in part to the ambiguous status of the grantee with respect to his own government. He is taxed as a federal employee but is usually denied the Commissary and Army Post Office privileges available to diplomatic and International Cooperation Administration personnel on the grounds that he is a private citizen and not a government official. On the other hand, much as the Fulbright grantee may desire and press for these privileges in order to make life simpler and more comfortable, he also sees in them a mixed blessing, since they link him more closely to the Embassy, alter his relationship to the native community, and restrict his freedom of action. The grantee may also be confused as to the relative roles of the Embassy and the Fulbright Foundation in the control and direction of the program, and he may not be sure to which agency he is really accountable. These ambivalences and uncertainties open the way to misunderstandings and conflicts, to feelings of insecurity, and sometimes to what seems to the grantee to be inequitable treatment. For example, an American professor who served as a Fulbright lecturer in the Philippines in 1956 was notified in 1961 that he owed the United States \$189.70 for overpayment of his stipend because he left Manila six days before the expiration date of the grant, even though he had finished his teaching, and the payment and his departure were approved by the local Fulbright Foundation. Clarification of these interagency relationships is an urgent need in some countries, and would perhaps do more than anything else to add to the effectiveness and the morale of the grantees.

Finding a satisfactory place in the local educational community may also be difficult, although here the grantee has the great advantage of filling the well understood and traditionally honored role of a visiting professor. In all formal relationships he will encounter the greatest cordiality and courtesy; his problem will be to work effectively in an educational environment, rather like that of America a half century ago, which in its dependence upon lecturing, memorization, and examinations bears little resemblance to university education in America today. Attempts to introduce an American approach emphasizing reading, discussion, and problem solving will have limited and temporary success at best, since they are poorly adapted to the basic facts of educational life in most Asian universities and are apt to be viewed by the visitor's colleagues as a threat to the methods to which they are committed. Just where then does the visiting Fulbright professor fit in? This is a difficult question, and each grantee has to answer it for himself in the light of the local situation, giving due, but not excessive, regard to the social, economic, and cultural factors which make Asian education, however exasperating it may be to the visitor, what it is. If the visiting professor finds a working solution to this problem, he can be well satisfied. Many do not. Some of those who do not, instead of feeling disheartened, take their eye off the classroom and contribute and receive much through informal relationships with students and faculty colleagues and through extracurricular activities.

AN EDUCATIONAL PARADOX

One cannot visit the Asian universities without noting an interesting educational paradox. Although the universities themselves are outwardly patterned after the European models, the social, economic, and cultural bases of education in Asia are very different from those in the West and call for new concepts and techniques of exchange closely related to the conditions of underdevelopment rather than to the European systems.

A good example of this is the different way in which research awards are viewed in Asia. There the local Fulbright boards are reluctant to offer awards for the kind of research usually undertaken in Europe, mainly locating or gaining access to pertinent data or background materials, discussing various implications of these materials with European specialists, and eventually writing and publishing an article or book in the United States. To the Asian educator this kind of research seems like an extractive process, an export of knowledge which is then refined abroad without providing training or stimulation to local scholars or otherwise benefiting the host community.

And yet, the Asian countries urgently need to develop their research capacities. Without productive research and scholarship, the light which fresh and relevant knowledge might shed upon a nation's economic, social, and political problems is unavailable to its leaders when it is critically needed. The emphasis, however, should be on problems related to national growth and development, on collaboration between foreign and native scholars, and on publication in Asian journals. If in connection with each research award offered to an American

research scholar, the Fulbright program were to offer a matching award to a native scholar so that both could work jointly on a problem of local significance, it would do a great deal to overcome the present tendency of the Fulbright boards in Asia to spend practically all their money on lectureships and little, if any, on research.

The main point to be made, however, is that the Western way may not be—is usually not—the best way for Asia. One does not fully appreciate this until he goes there and sees the program through Asian eyes.

THE COMMITTEE ON PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT IN YOUTH

by Ralph W. Tyler*

WHEN this committee of the Council was appointed in October 1957,¹ it was given wide latitude in determining the ways in which it would advance research in its area of interest. It was pointed out by the President of the Council that the study of youth and of the institutions in which young people are growing up and developing into adults could profitably engage the research efforts of many social scientists, providing significant opportunities both for basic social science research and for applications of importance to social policy.

Early in its deliberations the committee delineated the area in which it would do its initial work, the purposes it would seek to achieve, and the means by which it would carry on its activities. Ultimately, it would hope to stimulate research in the whole range of situations and environments in which youth are living but, initially, the committee decided to limit its attention to the college and university environment. With the large and increasing number of persons attending college, it is there that more than a third of American youth are to be found for a part of their adolescence. The college situation is more easily accessible to social scientists than the noncollege environment, and the influence or lack of influence of the college situation has far-reaching effects on contemporary society. Nearly four years later, the committee is beginning to extend its area of interest

beyond the college but the initial concentration we believe to have been justified.

The purposes the committee hopes to serve by its work are two: In the first place it seeks to stimulate the involvement of many more social scientists in studies of youth and of the institutions in which youth develop. The committee believes that here there is excellent opportunity for basic research on personality, on development, on social institutions, their structure, functioning, and effects, and on complex learning. This area represents an important part of society; concepts, theories, and generalizations dealing with human behavior and social institutions are applicable in this domain, and can be derived and tested through investigations in this area. It is obvious, too, that highly significant questions of social policy arise in connection with youth development in college. Furthermore, the college environment is more accessible for study than are factories, families, political organizations, or churches. In the second place, the committee hopes to assist in the acquisition of more adequate knowledge about youth development.

The committee is supported by a grant of \$150,000 made to the Council in 1957. It has been spending this sum at a rate of about \$35,000 per year. It does not have funds enough to finance large research projects nor to conduct major research of its own. Hence, the committee decided to work as a facilitating agent in stimulating research, in helping persons conducting research in various parts of the country to learn from each other, to assist in the extension of research projects already under way, to support planning conferences, to support the development of needed instruments of investigation and measurement, and to provide needed clearinghouse or information services. The committee has met 11 times since it was appointed. Each of these sessions has been devoted to a review of the situation in terms of the purposes out-

* This report presents the substance of the author's remarks at the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Council, September 1961.

¹ The members of the committee during the academic year 1960-61 were Dana L. Farnsworth, Harvard University; Chester W. Harris, University of Wisconsin; T. R. McConnell, University of California, Berkeley; Theodore M. Newcomb, University of Michigan; C. Robert Pace, University of California, Los Angeles; Nevitt Sanford, Stanford University; Ralph W. Tyler, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (chairman); Robin M. Williams, Jr., Cornell University; staff, Francis H. Palmer.

lined above, and to the planning of further means for facilitating research in this area.

A brief listing of the particular activities undertaken or supported by the committee will illustrate its ways of working. In June 1958 a week's working conference was held at the University of Michigan. This brought together 18 social scientists, from 14 institutions, who were conducting or planning to conduct follow-up studies of former college students to learn more of the long-time influences of college experiences. This conference outlined questions to be answered, data to be collected, instruments and measures to be used, and means of treating and interpreting data.² In January 1959 a three-day meeting was held in New York of 8 research specialists concerned with the need for and development of personality measures that are particularly relevant to the educational purposes of the college. In March 1959 a three-day conference was held at Andover, Massachusetts, which was attended by 51 social scientists currently engaged in studies of college influences on personality. At this conference 20 studies were presented for information and criticism, and a great deal of informal communication took place at the Inn where the participants were housed and the conference sessions held. A report on the proceedings of this conference was widely distributed.³ The committee is also supporting the distribution of occasional newsletters, prepared by a Harvard group, to the participants in the conference and other interested persons.

Nevitt Sanford, one of the committee members, in 1958 prepared a bibliography on research on higher education. In March 1959 the committee voted to help support the distribution of this bibliography to social scientists engaged in this area of research. In the summer of 1959, under the leadership of Theodore Newcomb, a work group spent several weeks in reviewing research on student peer cultures and outlining a monograph on the description and measurement of peer cultures. Since that time the manuscript of the monograph has been completed and is now ready for publication.

Work conferences in the summers of 1959 and 1960 of a group headed by George G. Stern of Syracuse University have resulted in the development of a new measuring scale for authoritarianism and rigidity of personality. This continuing activity is being supported by the committee as one part of its effort to develop needed instruments of measurement in this area. The committee is also supporting the joint preparation by Benjamin S.

Bloom of the University of Chicago and David R. Krathwohl of Michigan State University of a manual outlining a taxonomy of attitudes, interests, and values. This taxonomy should help to identify some of the significant variables for study.

Since the fall of 1958 the committee has supported extension of the comparative studies being made by T. R. McConnell, and his staff, of student characteristics and institutional impact, so as to add data from several different kinds of colleges not included in the original studies. The committee has also supported some extensions of the study of Vassar College students and alumnae, and of the use of the College Characteristics Index in small colleges not in the original study. Committee funds also enabled C. Robert Pace to make a factor analysis of the data obtained with the initial form of the College Characteristics Index, and to develop a new and improved form for measuring certain major aspects of the college environment.

Chester Harris is arranging a small conference of statisticians to outline the problems involved in measuring personality change. The work conference will be held on November 13-15 at the University of Wisconsin.

The committee has been concerned with the vague and undefined variable referred to in several of the studies as "administrative structure," "administration," "administrative policies," or "administrative climate." At its meeting in June 1961 it authorized Messrs. McConnell and Pace to explore this area and to initiate steps toward clearer definition, clearer description, and measurement of variables which are at present treated in a general undefined way.

When the committee met in December 1960 Robert MacLeod of Cornell University presented a request, from the Interuniversity Committee on the Superior Student, that the Committee on Personality Development in Youth stimulate and assist scientific studies of honors programs and more generally that it aid the acquisition of more knowledge about the nurture of human talents. As a result of this request, Paul Heist, representing Mr. McConnell's staff, and Messrs. Newcomb, Palmer, and Tyler visited the headquarters of the Interuniversity Committee on the Superior Student at Boulder and discussed with Joseph Cohen and his staff the possible approaches which might help to get such studies under way. In June Mr. Cohen held a conference of about 40 directors of honors programs at which Messrs. Heist, Newcomb, and Tyler presented the outlines of such studies and answered questions raised by the directors. More than 30 colleges and universities have written subsequently to indicate their interest in taking part in studies of superior students and naming social scientists from their faculties who would be inter-

² A report on this conference, "College Influences on Personality Development," by Donald G. Marquis, appeared in *Items*, September 1958, pp. 27-30.

³ A brief report, "Research on College Influences on Personality," by Lloyd Morrisett, Jr., also appeared in *Items*, September 1959, pp. 28-31.

ested in conducting such studies. The committee expects to arrange a conference of these social scientists at which plans for such research can be worked out, since this appears to be an area in which significant research can be stimulated.

The committee is also beginning to work in the area of the noncollege environment of youth. It has initiated conversations with social scientists in the Department of Defense and in the Peace Corps, for both of these are environments in which youth live and develop or fail to develop. The committee is also seeking to encourage research in civilian employment situations where youth take jobs after high school. If one or more good opportunities for research in the noncollege environment can be found, the committee hopes to work in this area much as it has in the area of the college environment.

From time to time the committee has reviewed the progress being made in terms of its purposes. It is clear that there are now at least 60 more social scientists conducting research on college youth than were involved in such research when the committee was formed. How far the committee's efforts have influenced the greater participation of social scientists in this kind of research one cannot tell, but most of them have been involved in conferences sponsored by the committee, or have been in communication with committee members, or have used instruments developed with the aid of the com-

mittee, or have received materials distributed by the committee. It seems safe to say that it has had some influence in extending the interests of social scientists into this field.

The extent to which the committee has contributed to its second purpose, facilitating the formulation of social science knowledge relating to youth development, is still harder to assess. The volume on social science and the college edited by Nevitt Sanford, which is now in press,⁴ represents a further extension of knowledge, as does the forthcoming volume by T. R. McConnell on diversity in higher education, and the manuscript edited by Theodore Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson on peer cultures. These works are largely the product of committee members and others who have been working closely with the committee. There are many other articles, a few monographs, and several extensive manuscripts which present an increasing body of knowledge. We hope that the committee's work has aided many of these studies but we have no evidence on this point. As we proceed to assist scientific studies of the college and of the noncollege environment, we shall seek also to trace more clearly the influence of our efforts so that we may find out which activities have helped and which have been of little assistance.

⁴ *The American College*, scheduled for publication by John Wiley & Sons, New York, late in 1961.

THE DARTMOUTH CONFERENCE ON AN ECONOMETRIC MODEL OF THE UNITED STATES

by Lawrence R. Klein

THE Council's Committee on Economic Stability¹ at its first meeting in December 1959 agreed upon the importance of constructing a new econometric model of the United States.² There are models of its economy in existence or in the process of being constructed, but these are highly aggregative and have limited possibilities of application. The committee appointed a subcommittee, consisting of James S. Duesenberry and Lawrence R. Klein (joint chairmen), David W. Lusher, Geoffrey H.

Moore, and Avram L. Kisselgoff, to explore the possibility of constructing a new model that would be much more effective than any existing or contemplated scheme in forecasting the trade cycle or in guiding economic policy.

The subcommittee recommended a new approach to modelbuilding. The limited scope of most other efforts to construct an economy-wide model can be attributed to the fact that they have been basically "one man" jobs or, at best, undertaken by a small, closely knit research team with not more than two or three principal investigators. The subcommittee suggested that a large research group be assembled for periodic meetings and that the members of the group be engaged in relevant research between meetings. This group was to be composed of several principal investigators, each responsible for some major sector of the economy or methodological segment of the model. Thus, instead of the small, closely knit

¹ The members of the committee during 1960-61 were R. A. Gordon, University of California, Berkeley (chairman); Moses Abramovitz, Stanford University; James S. Duesenberry, Harvard University; Bert G. Hickman, Brookings Institution; Lawrence R. Klein, University of Pennsylvania; David W. Lusher, Council of Economic Advisers; Geoffrey H. Moore, National Bureau of Economic Research.

² An econometric model is a system of mathematical equations with statistically determined coefficients (determined from actual observations of the working of the economy) that attempts to describe economic activity. We are here concerned with such statistical systems that describe activity throughout the economy as a whole.

research team, a federation of major research projects, united at periodic conferences and held together by two coordinators, was decided upon. The subcommittee outlined the segmentation of the project and made some revisions in this after a planning session with the principal investigators. On the basis of this planning the Council obtained a grant from the National Science Foundation to finance the project.

Early in February the principal investigators met in New York with the members of the subcommittee. We agreed on the main bodies of data to be used, methods of achieving mutual consistency among the separate investigations, and the research responsibilities of each participant. Each person prepared a report during the months following this planning session, and we met as a group at Dartmouth College on August 7-25. The participants in this 3-week session and the research areas for which each is responsible in the project follow:

Principal investigators

Daniel H. Brill, Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors	Monetary sector
Paul G. Darling, Bowdoin College	Inventories and orders
Robert Eisner, Northwestern University	Investment and sales expectations
Franklin M. Fisher, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Statistical methods
Karl A. Fox, Iowa State University	Input-output
Charles C. Holt, University of Wisconsin	Simulation and business cycle control
Dale W. Jorgenson, University of California, Berkeley	Business investment
Edwin Kuh, Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Factor shares
Stanley Lebergott, Stanford University (on leave from Bureau of the Budget)	Labor force and unemployment
David W. Lusher, Council of Economic Advisers	Government receipts and expenditures
Sherman J. Maisel, University of California, Berkeley	Residential and commercial construction
Geoffrey H. Moore, National Bureau of Economic Research	Business cycle characteristics
Rudolph R. Rhomberg, International Monetary Fund	Foreign trade and balance of payments
Charles L. Schultze, University of Maryland	Prices and wages
Daniel B. Suits, University of Michigan	Consumption
Louis Weiner, Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors	Government receipts and expenditures

Coordinators

James S. Duesenberry, Harvard University
Lawrence R. Klein, University of Pennsylvania

Committee members and guests

Moses Abramovitz, Stanford University
R. A. Gordon, University of California, Berkeley
Bert G. Hickman, Brookings Institution
Gary Fromm, Harvard University
Zvi Griliches, University of Chicago

George Jaszi, Department of Commerce
Avram L. Kisselgoff, Allied Chemical Corporation

M. Herbert Schwartz, Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors

W. Tims, Central Planning Bureau, the Netherlands

Research assistants

Jarvis Babcock, Iowa State University

Frank Edwards, Harvard University

Mitsugu Nakamura, University of Pennsylvania

The summer conference was successful in bringing all the different investigators together in a common discussion in which each separate research effort could be adjusted toward fitting into a systematic whole. Each investigator gave a report on his sector. In most cases a large amount of statistical and theoretical analysis had been invested in the sector studies. Additional calculations were made during the course of the meetings on the Dartmouth and the Federal Reserve computers. Responsibilities were designated, and it is expected that participants will come to a second research conference next summer, each with a tentative set of equations for his sector and series of prepared data. After next summer's conference, the coordinators will assemble the complete set of data and a final system of hypothetical equations for an ultimate computer run in which all relationships of the model will be estimated together.

The Dartmouth meetings were highly educational. The participants comprised an unusual array of talent. Each person knew economic theory and statistical theory, and could provide a realistic description of behavior associated with his own sector. Many also were well informed about other sectors, and criticism was highly constructive. New ideas about model construction came out of the discussions.

There are obvious advantages and disadvantages involved in this approach toward model building. No small research unit would be able to draw upon such an outstanding collection of talent and variety of ideas. During the course of the Dartmouth meetings we felt some conviction that we were actually coming up with a model that would differ from most of its predecessors in important ways and one that probably would not have been produced by any individual.

Disadvantages in our approach are the possibility of heterogeneity and lack of complete research discipline and coordination. Each separate investigator may be inclined to attach too much importance to many small points within his sector. These small points may not be significant when considered from the point of view of an over-all model of the economy. The Dartmouth conference showed that a model may become large through the introduction of many new explanatory variables.

Most of these require endogenous explanation within the complete system, and this adds greatly to the number of equations in the system. We also found that a model may become large through a high level of disaggregation in each sector. For example, we opened the conference with a discussion of the determination of prices and wages. It was proposed that this analysis ultimately be carried out for each major manufacturing sector, agriculture, mining, communications, transportation, utilities, trade, finance, government, and possibly three or four more sectors. In all, this would involve about 30 disaggregated sectors. Using a 30 x 30 input-output matrix we developed, in the conference discussions, means of relating these primary producing sectors to final demand sectors of the national income accounts. Such a complete system would become extremely large, involving more than one hundred equations.

The project coordinators therefore proposed that the model be constructed on three levels: (1) All manufacturing, possibly split into durables and nondurables, and two or three other producing sectors should be separately treated in the most aggregative model. In all the separate studies where industrial disaggregation is proposed, separate equations for all manufacturing should be estimated. This will be a feasible model within the scope of the project. (2) An intermediate system should be designed with a few manufacturing sectors and a total number of approximately 10-12 producing industries. This too should be feasible. (3) The large 30-sector system should be laid out, but it is not certain that it could be completed by 1962.

One of the most interesting ideas growing out of the conference was a method for combining input-output analysis with the usual type of econometric model. This has not previously been done. In the end, we should have a much more satisfactory explanation of prices, and this has been a weak point in other models.

The conference was helpful in showing investigators which variables, among the vast number proposed, are likely to be significant and which are not likely to contribute much to the final explanation of economic activity. We opened new possibilities for the endogenous explanation of labor supply, something that has been omitted in previous models.

On the basis of results presented at Dartmouth, we expect to have a sharper explanation of consumption (particularly automobiles and durables); a fuller pic-

ture of the inventory process between materials, goods in process, and finished goods; an explanation of orders and their influence in inventories; a more accurate distribution of the lag between housing starts and completions; a more useful explanation of the lag structures of business investment and the influence of capacity on capital formation; an improved explanation of the relationship between investment expectations and actual investment; a more complete explanation of foreign trade and an extension to the balance of payments; an endogenous explanation of part of government expenditures and a sharper assessment of the impact of government on the economy.

A full coordination between the real and monetary sectors has never been achieved in statistical models of the economy. In our discussions we outlined the most important relationships to be determined in the monetary sector and placed priorities on those—mainly concerned with the determination of interest rates—that must be ready soon to be used in other parts of the model.

During the course of our discussions we discovered the need for incorporation of an additional sector dealing with the determination of agricultural income, and an assignment will be made for that area. Problems concerning data arose frequently, and we discussed practical means for obtaining necessary data from government agencies. The visit of George Jaszi to our conference in connection with another meeting of the Committee on Economic Stability was fortunate, for we were able to discuss with him the obtaining of special series from the National Income Division, Department of Commerce.

Computing problems in the present stage of our research are being generously handled by the office of the Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors. Herbert Schwartz, who is in charge of its computing facilities, explained the capabilities of their installation. We established procedures for the submission of material for computing during the second year of the project.

The project's two coordinators have undertaken to write out a proposed model of the whole system. They will do this for the different levels of aggregation mentioned above. For the most aggregative version they will try to assign rough estimates of parameter values, after consultation with sector specialists, so that Charles Holt can study the properties of the system in computer simulation runs.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC CENSUS DATA

John Perry Miller (chairman), Francis M. Boddy, Robert W. Burgess, Howard C. Gieves, Frank A. Hanna, George J. Stigler, Ralph J. Watkins, J. Fred Weston.

Arrangements have been made with the Yale University Press for publication of the results of the studies that have been conducted under the auspices of the committee since 1957, for the purpose of stimulating better use of the data collected in the economic censuses of 1954. As the first monograph in a series entitled "Economic Census Studies," the Press expects to publish *Changes in the Location of Manufacturing in the United States since 1929*, by Victor R. Fuchs, early in 1962.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Gabriel A. Almond (chairman), R. Taylor Cole, James S. Coleman, Herbert Hyman, Joseph LaPalombara, Sigmund Neumann, Lucian W. Pye, Robert E. Ward; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

A seminar on communications and political development, the first of several on political development to be sponsored by the committee during 1961-63, was held at Gould House, Dobbs Ferry, on September 11-14, under the chairmanship of Mr. Pye. The titles and authors of papers prepared for the seminar were: "Mass Media and Political Socialization: The Role of Patterns of Communication," by Herbert Hyman, Columbia University; "Conditions Determining Whether the Spread of the Mass Media Will Facilitate or Impede Modernization and Democratic Development," by Daniel Lerner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; "National Character and Economic Growth in Turkey and Iran," by David C. McClelland, Harvard University; "Writer and Journalist in the Transitional Society," by Herbert Passin, University of Washington; "The Mass Media and Their Interpersonal Social Functions in the Process of Modernization," by Ithiel de Sola Pool, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; "Communication Development and Economic Development," by Wilbur Schramm, Stanford University; "Demagogues and Cadres in the Political Development of the New States," by Edward Shils, University of Chicago; and papers on communications and political development in Communist China, by Frederick T. C. Yu, Montana State University; in Thailand, by James N. Mosel, George Washington University; and in Turkey, by Frederick W. Frey, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Other participants, besides the members of the committee and Pendleton Herring and Bryce Wood, included: Te Cheng Chiang, *Ta Hua Evening News*, Taipei; W. Phillips Davison, Council on Foreign Relations; Yukio Ichinose, Kyodo News Service, Tokyo; Keval Ratanmal Malkani, *Organiser*, Delhi; Robert E. Scott, University of Illinois; Clarence E. Thurber, Ford Foundation; W. Howard Wriggins, Department of State. The papers are being revised by

the authors, and the committee hopes to arrange for their publication.

LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

(Joint with American Council of Learned Societies)

Robert N. Burr (chairman), Henry P. de Vries, Fred P. Ellison, Wendell C. Gordon, Irving A. Leonard, Charles Wagley, Robert Wauchope; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

Under the sponsorship of the joint committee, and with the aid of a grant from the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics, an inter-American conference on research and training in sociology was held at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, on August 25-27. Participants in the conference were: Guillermo Briones, University of Chile; John A. Clausen, University of California, Berkeley; L. A. Costa Pinto, University of Brazil; Sanford M. Dornbusch, Stanford University; Orlando Fals Borda, National University of Colombia; Gino Germani, University of Buenos Aires; Peter Heintz, Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences, Santiago, Chile; Rex D. Hopper, Brooklyn College; Wilburg Jiménez-Castro, University of Costa Rica; Joseph A. Kahl, Washington University; Thomas Ktsanes, Tulane University; Seymour M. Lipset, University of California, Berkeley; Wilbert E. Moore, Princeton University; H. M. Phillips, Department of Social Sciences, UNESCO; Jose Arthur Rios, Bureau of Social and Economic Research, Rio de Janeiro; T. Lynn Smith, University of Florida; William C. Spencer, Institute of International Education; Joseph M. Stycos, Cornell University; Charles Wagley, Columbia University; Donald Young, Russell Sage Foundation; Elbridge Sibley and Bryce Wood. The American Sociological Association cooperated with the joint committee in planning this conference, the purpose of which was to improve communication between sociologists in different American countries. No formal papers were presented. Sessions were devoted to discussion of the following topics: (1) development of the discipline of sociology in Latin America and the United States, introduced by Messrs. Germani and Moore; (2) training and careers in sociology, introduced by Messrs. Heintz and Young; (3) development of sociological research, introduced by Mr. Briones; (4) scholarly exchanges and communication, introduced by Mr. Kahl. It was the consensus of the participants that it would be desirable to hold future conferences of sociologists from Latin America and the United States, dealing with substantive research; for such conferences papers would be prepared and circulated in advance.

MATHEMATICS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Patrick Suppes (chairman), David Blackwell, James S. Coleman, Clyde H. Coombs, Robert Dorfman, W. K. Estes, Howard Raiffa; *staff*, Francis H. Palmer.

In anticipation of completion of financial arrangements by the Council, the committee is planning four six-week

summer research institutes for advanced graduate students and recent recipients of the Ph.D. who are interested in mathematical methods in social science fields. The institutes will be modeled after the training institutes sponsored by the Council's Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists in the summer of 1957 at Stanford University. The emphasis in the institutes planned for the summer of 1962 will be on producing models and developing theory. The subjects and directors of the four institutes will be: application of learning theory to small groups, Cletus J. Burke of Indiana University; choice behavior and measurement, Frank Restle of Indiana University; social choice mechanisms with applications to political science, John C. Harsanyi of Wayne State University; bargaining, negotiation, and conflict, Harold W. Kuhn of Princeton University. The first two institutes named will be located at universities on the West Coast, and the latter two will be held in New England. Each institute will be in session from June 18 through July 27, 1962, and will have 12 participants who will be selected by the committee on the basis of applications, which should be submitted to the office of the Council by March 1, 1962.

Further information will be given in the December issue of *Items* and will be provided directly to interested academic departments as soon as arrangements for the institutes are complete. Inquiries should be addressed to the Committee on Mathematics in Social Science Research, Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

PRESERVATION AND USE OF ECONOMIC DATA

Richard Ruggles (chairman), E. J. Engquist, Jr., Stanley Lebergott, Guy H. Orcutt, Joseph A. Pechman.

This exploratory committee was appointed, as the result of a conference held by the Council on December 19, 1960, to consider the possibility of increasing knowledge of, and access to, bodies of economic data, especially those suitable for use in research in cooperation with major computing centers. The committee devoted two meetings, in April and July, to examination of the feasibility of selecting manageable bodies of data for research purposes from the vast range of statistical materials produced by government and other agencies, of providing research workers with information regarding these data, of establishing convenient methods of access to them, including assistance in meeting technical difficulties concerning disclosure of confidential materials, and of devising an appropriate assignment for a Council or other committee that might work effectively with data-producing agencies and with university research centers. The committee agreed that while any continuing effort in these directions might well be concentrated initially on economic data, the effort should be given direction broad enough to encompass problems of research data in other disciplines as well. Its conclusions were reported in September to the Committee on Problems and Policy, which approved the appointment of a reconstituted committee to be responsible for the initiation of measures to improve the availability of materials useful to economists and other social scientists.

PERSONNEL

DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF THE COUNCIL

At the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Council held in September, Abram Bergson of Harvard University, H. Field Haviland, Jr. of Brookings Institution, Herbert A. Simon of Carnegie Institute of Technology, and Malcolm M. Willey of the University of Minnesota were elected directors-at-large for the two-year term 1962-63.

Herbert A. Simon was elected chairman of the board of directors; Wayne H. Holtzman of the University of Texas, vice-chairman; Louis Gottschalk of the University of Chicago, secretary; and Philip J. McCarthy of Cornell University, treasurer. The following members of the board were elected as its Executive Committee: S. S. Wilks, Princeton University (chairman), Harold F. Dorn of the National Institutes of Health, George H. Hildebrand of Cornell University, David B. Truman of Columbia University, and Donald Young of the Russell Sage Foundation. V. O. Key, Jr. of Harvard University was named chairman of the Committee on Problems and Policy; and Paul J. Bohannon of Northwestern University and R. A. Gordon of the University of California, Berkeley, were elected members of the committee. Its other members are Chauncy D. Harris, Wilbert E. Moore, David M. Potter, and ex officio: Pendleton Herring, Herbert A. Simon, and Wayne H. Holtzman.

COUNCIL COMMITTEES ON FELLOWSHIPS

AND GRANTS

Auxiliary Research Awards. S. S. Wilks of Princeton University (chairman), John M. Blum of Yale University, Joseph B. Casagrande of the University of Illinois, Otis Dudley Duncan of the University of Chicago, Henry W. Ehrmann of Dartmouth College, Robert R. Sears of Stanford University, and Joseph J. Spengler of Duke University have been appointed a committee to administer the program of auxiliary research awards, which is offered in 1961-62 as described on page 40 infra.

Faculty Research Fellowships. John Useem of Michigan State University has been appointed chairman of the committee for 1961-62. John D. Lewis of Oberlin College, Gardner Lindzey of the University of Minnesota, and Joseph J. Mathews of Emory University have been reappointed; Lawrence E. Fouraker of Harvard University and George E. Mowry of the University of California, Los Angeles, have been newly appointed to the committee.

Grants-in-Aid. Vincent H. Whitney of the University of Pennsylvania has been reappointed chairman for 1961-62. Also reappointed to the committee are Paul J. Bohannon of Northwestern University, James M. Buchanan of the Uni-

versity of Virginia, William H. Riker of Lawrence College, and Gordon Wright of Stanford University. Alfred D. Chandler, Jr. of Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been newly appointed to the committee.

Grants for Research on Governmental Affairs. All the members of this committee, which administers the program of senior research awards in American governmental affairs, have been reappointed for 1961-62: Robert E. Cushman of the National Historical Publications Commission, as chairman; Alexander Heard, University of North Carolina; Dean E. McHenry, University of California, Los Angeles; Elmer B. Staats, Bureau of the Budget; Benjamin F. Wright, University of Texas.

International Conference Travel Grants. Leonard Krieger of Yale University has been named chairman, and Irwin T. Sanders of Boston University has been reappointed a member of the committee for 1961-62. Newly appointed members are Harold C. Conklin of Columbia University, Rowland A. Egger of the University of Virginia, George Garvy of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Roger W. Russell of Indiana University; and Harry Venneman of the Bureau of the Budget.

Political Behavior. David B. Truman of Columbia University has been reappointed chairman of this committee, which administers the program of grants for research on American governmental and legal processes. Also reappointed to the committee are William M. Beaney of Princeton University, Robert A. Dahl of Yale University, Oliver Garceau of East Boothbay, Maine, V. O. Key, Jr. of Harvard University, Avery Leiserson of Vanderbilt University, and Edward H. Levi of the University of Chicago.

Political Theory and Legal Philosophy Fellowships. J. Roland Pennock, Swarthmore College, chairman; David Easton, University of Chicago; Jerome Hall, Indiana University; and Robert G. McCloskey, Harvard University, have been reappointed for 1961-62. John H. Hallowell, Duke University, and Sheldon S. Wolin, University of California, Berkeley, have been newly appointed to the committee.

Social Science Personnel. Wayne H. Holtzman of the University of Texas has been named chairman of the committee, which has charge of the Council's research training fellowship program. Newly appointed to the committee are Harry Alpert of the University of Oregon and George H. Hildebrand of Cornell University. M. Margaret Ball of Wellesley College, David M. Schneider of the University of Chicago, and Paul Webbink of the Council have been reappointed.

APPOINTMENTS TO RESEARCH PLANNING COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

William H. Nicholls of Vanderbilt University, Philip M. Raup of the University of Minnesota, and George S. Tolley of North Carolina State College have been appointed members of the Committee on Agricultural Economics.

Martin Bronfenbrenner of the University of Minnesota has been appointed a member of the Committee on Economic Stability.

Gardner Lindzey of the University of Minnesota (chairman), Ernst W. Caspari of the University of Rochester, Theodosius Dobzhansky of Columbia University, David A. Hamburg of Stanford University, Jerry Hirsch of the University of Illinois, Gerald E. McClearn of the University of California, Berkeley, and J. N. Spuhler of the University of Michigan have been asked to serve as a new Committee on Genetics and Behavior.

William Kessen of Yale University has been appointed chairman of the Committee on Intellectual Processes Research for 1961-62.

John W. Riley, Jr. of the Equitable Life Assurance Society and Rutgers University has been appointed to the Committee on Population Census Monographs.

Bert F. Green, Jr. of Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been appointed a member of the Committee on Simulation of Cognitive Processes.

Edgar M. Hoover of the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association has been appointed to the Committee on Urbanization.

COUNCIL FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS OFFERED IN 1961-62: DATES FOR FILING APPLICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS OF AWARDS

Applications for fellowships and grants offered by the Council during the coming year will be due, and awards will be announced, on or before the respective dates listed below. Because full consideration cannot be assured for late applications, and because preliminary correspondence is frequently necessary to determine under which program a given proposal should be submitted, prospective applicants should communicate with the Council if possible at least three weeks in advance of the pertinent closing date. Inquiries and requests for application forms should indicate the candidate's age, place of permanent residence, present

position or activity, degrees held and degree currently sought if any, the general nature of the proposed training or research, and the duration or amount of support desired. A brochure describing the several programs is available on request addressed to Social Science Research Council Fellowships and Grants, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.:

Research Training Fellowships, and Fellowships for Completion of Doctoral Dissertations, applications, December 1, 1961; awards, April 2, 1962

Fellowships in Political Theory and Legal Philosophy, applications, December 1, 1961; awards, April 2, 1962

Faculty Research Fellowships, and Grants-in-Aid of Research, *first competition*: applications, November 1, 1961; awards, January 2, 1962; *second competition*: applications, February 1, 1962; awards, April 2, 1962

Senior Research Awards in American Governmental Affairs, nominations, November 1, 1961

Grants for Research on American Governmental and Legal Processes, applications, December 1, 1961; awards, February 15, 1962

Grants for Research on National Security Policy, applications, January 8, 1962; awards, March 1, 1962

*Grants for African Studies, applications, November 15, 1961; awards, January 2, 1962

*Grants for Asian Studies, applications to be submitted to American Council of Learned Societies, 345 East 46 Street, New York 17, N. Y., December 15, 1961; awards, within 10 weeks thereafter

*Grants for Studies of Contemporary China, applications, November 15, 1961; awards January 2, 1962

*Grants for Latin American Studies, applications, November 15, 1961; awards, January 2, 1962

*Grants for Near and Middle Eastern Studies, applications, November 15, 1961; awards, January 2, 1962

*Grants for Slavic and East European Studies, applications to be submitted to American Council of Learned Societies, 345 East 46 Street, New York 17, N. Y., December 15, 1961; awards within 10 weeks thereafter

International Conference Travel Grants for the following meetings, applications, January 15, 1962; awards, March 1, 1962

Congress of the International Economic Association

International Conference on Economic History

International Institute of Administrative Sciences

Grants may also be made for participation in national or other specialized meetings of social scientists in foreign countries.

*Travel grants for international conferences on Slavic and East European Studies, applications to be submitted to American Council of Learned Societies, 345 East 46 Street, New York 17, N. Y.

* Offered to research scholars in the social sciences and humanities, under a joint program of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council.

AUXILIARY RESEARCH AWARDS

Nominations are invited for the Council's second program of Auxiliary Research Awards, under which grants of \$4,000 each will be offered next spring to about 25 social scientists who will be selected on the basis of their past and prospective achievements in behavioral research. The grants may

be used by recipients in their discretion for purposes that will facilitate or enrich their research, without restriction as to time. Such purposes may include travel for consultation or gathering of data; employment of research assistants; data processing services; and securing additional free time for research. A grant may not be used to augment the recipient's salary. Grants are intended to supplement and not to displace other resources available to recipients.

Candidates may be nominated by social scientists familiar with their work. Individuals are not expected to make application in their own behalf. Nomination should be in the form of a letter addressed to the Council not later than February 1, 1962, briefly summarizing the candidate's career and the nature of his current research, and citing his principal research publications. It is not expected that a specific research proposal will be submitted; in this respect the Auxiliary Research Award program differs from the Council's other programs of grants for research. Awards will not be offered to persons born before 1922, to those who are still candidates for academic degrees, nor to those who received similar awards from the Council in 1958.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY: EXPANDED PROGRAM

Since distribution of the Council's announcement of fellowship and grant-in-aid offerings for 1961-62, funds have been obtained from the Carnegie Corporation of New York for continuation and expansion during 1961-62 and 1962-63 of the program of Grants for Research on National Security Policy. Grants will continue to be awarded for research on political and economic aspects of national security policy of the United States since 1939. In addition, applications are especially welcome from individuals whose research falls in the following categories: (1) comparative studies of European and American civil-military relations; (2) sociological studies of civil-military relations and of the military establishment; (3) studies of relationships among military officers, natural scientists, and officials of the federal government.

Applicants should possess the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent. Special consideration will be given to applicants from liberal arts colleges and other institutions that do not possess adequate financial resources for support of faculty research in this area, as well as to younger scholars. Grants may be used for travel and other research expenses or for maintenance in lieu of salary, or both, for up to a year or longer.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1961: GARDNER ACKLEY, PAUL J. BOHANNAN, JOHN A. CLAUSEN, HAROLD F. DORN, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, CHAUNCY D. HARRIS, H. FIELD HAVILAND, JR., PENDLETON HERRING, GEORGE H. HILDEBRAND, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, WAYNE H. HOLTZMAN, NATHAN KEYFITZ, LYLE H. LANIER, AVERY LEISERSON, EDWARD H. LEVI, PHILIP J. MCCARTHY, WILBERT E. MOORE, WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS, J. ROLAND PENNOCK, DAVID M. POTTER, NEVITT SANFORD, HERBERT A. SIMON, MELFORD E. SPIRO, DAVID B. TRUMAN, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG, T. CUYLER YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; FRANCIS H. PALMER; ROWLAND L. MITCHELL, JR.; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*